

## REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration and substantive effort given to this case. Claims 1, 4, 12 and 15 have been amended. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application.

The Examiner has objected to Figure 1. Paragraphs [0012] and [0019] have been amended to conform to Figure 1. No new matter has been added based on these amendments. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to Figure 1.

The Examiner has rejected claims 3 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants believe that the rejection properly refers to claims 4 and 15 based on the claim language discussed by the Examiner. Accordingly, claims 4 and 15 have been amended to satisfy the Examiner's objection. If Applicants have misinterpreted the Examiner's rejection, Applicants respectfully request a telephone interview with the Examiner in lieu of a final office action.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9 and 12-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0156812 to *Krasnoiarov et al.* in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0109197 to *Gardaz et al.* Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection based on the following remarks.

Independent claims 1 and 12 incorporate numerous features not disclosed in the prior art cited by the Examiner. For example, neither *Krasnoiarov et al.* nor *Gardaz et al.*, whether considered alone or in combination, discloses "compiling the converted deliverables for distribution over a plurality of delivery channels," as required by amended independent claims 1 and 12.

*Krasnoiarov et al.* teaches a method for “satisfying a single request from a client for a plurality of content components derived from content hosted by a plurality of distinct, separately accessible component servers.” *Krasnoiarov et al.*, Abstract. As the content components are received from the component servers, a main server “receives [each] content component, stores it, and awaits for remaining content components to be returned.” *Id.*, paragraph [0096]. Upon receiving all of the content components, the main server “communicat[es] the resulting content, processed and assembled, to the user terminal from which the original request was issued.” *Id.*, paragraph [0098]. *Krasnoiarov et al.* does not teach “compiling the converted deliverables for distribution over a plurality of delivery channels.” *Krasnoiarov et al.* merely teaches distributing resulting content over a single delivery channel between the main server and the user terminal that issued the original request.

*Gardaz et al.* does not overcome the deficiencies of *Krasnoiarov et al.* *Gardaz et al.* teaches a server that processes threads in parallel and converts files from one format to another, as stated by the Examiner. The system in *Gardaz et al.* “provides an output image associated with [a] multi-resolution representation to the second computer when the web page is accessed by the second computer.” *Gardaz et al.*, Abstract. *Gardaz et al.* does not teach “compiling the converted deliverables for distribution over a plurality of delivery channels,” as required by claims 1 and 12.

For at least this reason, claims 1 and 12 are allowable over the Examiner-cited prior art. Since claims 2-4, 6, 8 and 9 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of allowable independent claim 1 and claims 13-18 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of allowable independent claim 12, claims 2-4, 6, 8, 9 and 13-18 are likewise allowable over the Examiner-cited prior art.

The Examiner has rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Krasnoiarov et al.* in view of *Gardaz et al.* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,184,878 to *Alonso et al.* *Alonso et al.* does not overcome the deficiencies of *Krasnoiarov et al.* and *Gardaz et al.* *Alonso et al.* merely teaches a video-on-demand and Internet system that generates content for a particular end user terminal. *Alonso et al.* does not teach “compiling the converted deliverables for distribution over a plurality of delivery channels.” Accordingly, since claim 5 depends from and incorporates all of the limitations of allowable independent claim 1, claim 5 is likewise allowable over the prior art cited by the Examiner.

The Examiner has rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Krasnoiarov et al.* in view of *Gardaz et al.* and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0049842 to *Huetsch et al.* *Huetsch et al.* does not overcome the deficiencies of *Krasnoiarov et al.* and *Gardaz et al.* *Huetsch et al.* merely teaches a load balancing method between a master computing device and slave computing devices. *Huetsch et al.* does not teach “compiling the converted deliverables for distribution over a plurality of delivery channels.” Accordingly, since claim 7 depends from and incorporates all of the limitations of allowable independent claim 1, claim 7 is likewise allowable over the prior art cited by the Examiner.

The Examiner has rejected claim 10, 11, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Krasnoiarov et al.* in view of *Gardaz et al.* and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0123622 to *Gifford et al.* *Gifford et al.* does not overcome the deficiencies of *Krasnoiarov et al.* and *Gardaz et al.* *Gifford et al.* merely teaches the use of an interface to provide unified message services to a subscriber at the subscriber’s request. *Gifford et al.* does not teach “compiling the converted deliverables for distribution over a plurality of delivery channels.” Accordingly, since claims 10 and 11 depend from and incorporate all of the

limitations of allowable independent claim 1 and claims 19 and 20 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of allowable independent claim 12, claims 10, 11, 19 and 20 are likewise allowable over the prior art cited by the Examiner.

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed and/or accommodated. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections and objections. There being no other rejections or objections, Applicant respectfully requests that the current application be allowed and passed to issue.

If the Examiner believes for any reason that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, I invite the Examiner to telephone me directly.

### CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments to the claims and the remarks above, it is believed that pending claims 1-20 are in condition for final allowance and notice to such effect is respectfully requested. Although the Applicant believes no additional fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account No. 05-0426 for any fees that may be due in connection with this response. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this application, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone conference with the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,  
PEPPER HAMILTON LLP



Joseph T. Helmsen  
Registration No. 54,163

Pepper Hamilton LLP  
One Mellon Center, 50<sup>th</sup> Floor  
500 Grant Street  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219  
Telephone: 412.454.5000  
Facsimile: 412.281.0717  
Date: June 5, 2006